

CSC 301: INTRODUCTION TO SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

SPRINT 0 (PRELIMINARY SUBMISSION) GRADING RUBRIC

The assignment is graded out of 100. Final scores are rounded to the nearest whole point.

Method of score computation:

For each element a rating is assigned based on the rubric. Each rating has an associated point value: Excellent 100, Good 75, Adequate 65, Marginal 50, and Inadequate 0.

The scores for the elements are combined according to their respective weights to reach a score for that assignment part (out of 100).

The scores for the assignment parts are combined according to their respective weights to reach an overall score for the assignment (out of 100). The assignment grade is that overall score rounded to the nearest point.

PERSONAS [50% OF TOTAL]

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
-Two or more high quality personas provided -All required elements included: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gender• Age• Personality• Family• Appearance• Skills• Environment• Attitude towards technology, domain, etc.• Goals when using the system -Personas are highly relevant to the system -Description is of appropriate length and is well-written	-At least two personas provided - Most required elements included -Personas are relevant to the system -Description is of appropriate length -Any writing issues are minor and largely mechanical	-At least two personas provided - Some, but not all, required elements may not be included -Personas are largely relevant to system -Description may be somewhat brief / overly long -May have some issues with writing	-May be fewer than two personas provided -May be significant deficiencies with respect to required elements -Writing may suffer from issues that impair comprehensibility	-No personas provided, only one persona, or personas provided are highly deficient -May have significant writing issues the severely impair comprehensibility

USER STORIES [50% OF TOTAL]

Excellent	Good	Adequate	Marginal	Inadequate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At least 20 stories were generated -Key features are included is thorough and well thought out -Relevant persona clearly identified for each user story -All user stories identify goal/desire and all identify why/benefit -Any writing issues are minor and largely mechanical -Conversations with Product Owner recorded -Easy to derive test cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At least 20 stories were generated -Most key features are included and well thought out -Relevant persona clearly identified for most user stories -All user stories identify goal/desire and most identify why/benefit -Any writing issues are minor and largely mechanical -Most conversations with Product Owner recorded -Easy to derive most test cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -May be fewer than 20 stories generated -One or two key features may be missing -Details not well thought out -Relevant persona clearly identified for some, but not all user stories -All user stories goal/desire but may not have why/benefit -May have some issues with writing beyond mechanical; but meaning can be inferred -Many conversations with Product Owner are missing -Easy to derive test cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May be fewer than 20 stories generated -Multiple key features are missing -Details not thought out and may conflict -Relevant personas often not identified for user stories -All user stories goal/desire, but some may be unclear without context -Writing may suffer from issues that impair comprehensibility -Conversations with Product Owner are missing -Difficult to derive test cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Unclear evidence of use of user stories or user stories significantly deficient -No record of contact with Product Owner -Insufficient detail to derive test cases